

SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY LLP

PATENT, TRADEMARK & COPYRIGHT LAW

JAMES E. SHLESINGER
JOSEFINO P. DE LEON
MICHAEL M. ZADROZNY*
TERRENCE L.B. BROWN*
DANIEL T. EARLE

OF COUNSEL
B. EDWARD SHLESINGER, JR.

*ADMITTED TO A BAR OTHER THAN VIRGINIA

ESTABLISHED 1950

1420 KING STREET
SUITE 600
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314

GEORGE A. ARKWRIGHT (RET.)
GEORGE A. GARVEY (RET.)

TELEPHONE: (703) 684-5600
FAX: (703) 836-5288
FAX: (703) 836-5698
EMAIL: PATENTS@SAGLLP.COM

OUR REF. No. T-11/06

January 11, 2006

HAND CARRY

Commissioner for Trademarks
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1451

Re: HAVANA CLUB & DESIGN
Registration No. 1,031,651

RECEIVED
JAN 11 2006
U.S. PATENT &
TRADEMARK OFFICE

73023981 9202281

Dear Commissioner:

Accompanying this letter are the following documents for filing in connection with the above-referenced trademark registration.

1. Petition to Commissioner in the form of Kelley Drye & Warren's Letter dated January 11, 2006, including:

- a. Exhibit A:
TTAB decision in
Opposition No. 91/116,754
Havana Club Holdings, S.A. v.
Bjiffett
(TTAB March 13, 2003)

- b. Exhibit B:
License Application
Submitted by Ropes & Gray

TTAB

TTAB

Please check the fees due to Deposit Account No. 19-2105, and notify the undersigned in due course.



02-08-2006

01-11-2006

U.S. Patent & TMO/TM Mail Rcpt Dt. #34

U.S. Patent & TMO/TM Mail Rcpt Dt. #26

Commissioner for Trademarks
January 11, 2006
Page -2-

Any telephone calls regarding this letter should be directed
to Daniel T. Earle at (703) 684-5600.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel T. Earle

DTE/ls
Enclosures

SHLESINGER, ARKWRIGHT & GARVEY LLP
1420 King Street, Suite 600
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-5600

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

A LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP

101 PARK AVENUE

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10178

(212) 808-7800

WASHINGTON, DC
TYSONS CORNER, VA
CHICAGO, IL
STAMFORD, CT
PARSIPPANY, NJ
BRUSSELS, BELGIUM

AFFILIATE OFFICES
JAKARTA, INDONESIA
MUMBAI, INDIA

FACSIMILE
(212) 808-7897
www.kelleydrye.com

DIRECT LINE: (212) 808-7902
EMAIL: wgolden@kelleydrye.com

January 11, 2006

BY HAND DELIVERY

Commissioner for Trademarks
Box 1451
Alexandria VA 22313-1451

Re: HAVANA CLUB & Design (Reg. No. 1,031,651)

Dear Sir or Madam:

We represent Bacardi & Company Limited and Bacardi USA, Inc. (collectively, "Bacardi") in connection with intellectual property matters. Bacardi is the petitioner in Opposition No. 1-108, which seeks cancellation of the above-referenced registration (the "HAVANA CLUB Registration") on the ground, among others, that the registration was improperly renewed in 1996. We write in opposition to the renewal application filed by Estrant Empresa Cubana Exportadora de Alimentos y Productos Varios d/b/a Cubaexport ("Cubaexport") on or about December 14, 2005.

Cubaexport's attempt to renew the registration is in direct violation of existing laws and regulations. In accordance with the statements in the letter on behalf of Cubaexport regarding the renewal application, renewal of the HAVANA CLUB Registration has been prohibited by the Office of Foreign Assets Control ("OFAC"). Cubaexport's attempt to renew the registration is expressly prohibited by the Cuban Assets Control Regulations, 31 C.F.R. §§ 515.201; §515.203; §515.306; §515.309 to §515.313; and the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") has refused to accept Cubaexport's renewal application.

The PTO, *inter alia*, all dealings in property in which Cuba or a Cuban national has a direct or indirect interest, to the jurisdiction of the United States, 31 C.F.R. §515.201(b)(1) and (d). The PTO, therefore, which has the effect of evading or circumventing the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office ("PTO") 31 C.F.R. §515.201(c). The HAVANA CLUB Registration has an interest. See

FROM

1/16/2006 6THOMAS2 00000027 192105 1031651

01 FC:6005

100.00 BA

KENLEY DYKE & WARREN LLP

1. Missions
2. by 11, 2
3. WFO

2. R. §5 (b) defining "interest" as including "an interest of any nature whatsoever,
or in the United States or abroad. Cubaexport is a Cuban entity; in fact it is an
entity of the Cuban government. See Cubaexport's Combined
Application for Registration under §§ 8 and 9 at 1.
Cubaexport's application for NA CLUB Registration is prohibited by the
absence of a specific license from OFAC authorizing that particular
action.

On March 1, 1992, Section 515.327 of the CACRs, which had generally licensed
the registration and renewal of trademarks in
the United States, was amended as required by Section 211
of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1999,
No. 101-507, 116 Stat. 1033, as amended regulation, as currently in
effect.

(1) (a) as related to the registration and renewal in the United
States of trademarks or the United States Copyright Office
of copyrights, which the Government of Cuba or
any other entity has not consented.

(2) (b) (i) "shall not be registered or approved" pursuant to
the provisions of the Act relating to a mark, title name, or
other distinctive feature, substantially similar to a mark,
name, or other distinctive feature that was used in connection with a
business or other activity, if that term is defined in §515.336,
which term is defined in the title name, or commercial name, or
other distinctive feature, as defined in §515.336.

R. 101-507, 116 Stat. 1033, as amended regulation, as currently in
effect. The regulation falls under the exclusion of
the Act. The regulation is registered in the United States is
the trademark of the business (and owned) by José Arechebala,
a Cuban citizen who resides in Cuba. That business and all
other trademarks (and the trademark) were "confiscated" in 1960
by the Cuban government. R. §515.31² In *Havana Club*

KELLEY DRYE & WARREN LLP

Missie
11,
Three

ing, S.S. G. 4, 203 F.3d 116 (2d Cir. 2000), the Second Circuit found that
the re t... Havana Club, S.A., a Cuban corporation owned
ally... family, produced 'Havana Club' rum and owned
elme... use with its rum. JASA exported its rum to the United
... government, under the leadership of Fidel Castro,
... JASA's assets. Neither JASA nor its owners ever received
... assets from the Cuban government." 203 F.3d at 119-120.
e modern... Appeal Board in a proceeding involving the same HAVANA
... mar... logo and other old filings and granted summary judgment. *Havana*
... 116, 54 (T.T.A.B. Mar. 13, 2003) (a copy

... interest to all of JASA's rights in the
... JASA has ever consented, expressly or
... U.I. Registration by or on behalf of
... hereto. Accordingly, the renewal of
... by Section 15.527(a)(1) of the
... 1201.

... No. CU-74488 is groundless. That
... Ropes & G... to receive payment
... related to the legal representation of
... companies are defendants in a pending
... *Excerpt et al.*, 1:04-CV-00519 (EGS)
... is contrasting, among other things, a
... the validity of the prior (1996)
... License No. CU-74488, which

... of the Cuban
... after January

... and effective

... been settled pursuant to an
... other mutually agreed

SSC **SSC**

11

DE

The Court in this case authorizes *Ropes & Gray* to receive payment for the cost of expenses related thereto. It does not authorize *Cubaexport* to receive payment for the CAYANA CLUB Registration. The applicant is not permitted to enter into an unrelated transaction, in violation of the provisions of the CAERs.⁴ That unrelated transaction is the subject of the Lawsuit.

...trying to maintain the *status quo* by renewing the court's decision on the validity of the 1996 renewal of the validity of the 1996 renewal does not ... and regulations applicable to a further ... and C-1 accepts the denied effective legal ... with the law.

On 12/13/74, a USPTO Trademark Office dated December 13, 1974, was purportedly attached to the letter of 12/13/74 that appears on the USPTO electronic file 2 of the license, which apparently includes the information that the licensee is directed to submit a complete copy of the license to the Trademark Office and these components.

15 and that it does not ex- use compliance with
16 Paragraphs 4 and 5 It also recites that it
17 is made in the appli- tion and is subject to
 compliance with CDA regulations and the
 provisions of the d by Jones & Gray
 of the said proce- es and says nothing
 the (C) copy of the ence application is

EXHIBIT A

THIS OPINION IS NOT CITABLE
AS PRECEDENT OF THE TTAB

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
2900 Crystal Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513

NLO/AYL

Mailed: March 13, 2003

Opposition No. 91116754

HAVANA CLUB HOLDING S.A.

v.

JIMMY BUFFETT

Before (Sims, Walters, and Drost,
Administrative Trademark Judges.

By the Board:

Jimmy Buffett ("applicant"), seeks to register the mark HAVANAS AND BANANAS on the Principal Register for "menu items, namely, prepared alcoholic cocktails."¹ Havana Club Holding, S.A. ("opposer") has opposed registration on the grounds that the mark (1) is primarily geographically deceptively misdescriptive under Section 2(e)(3) of the Trademark Act because the goods do not originate from Cuba; (2) disparages and suggests a false connection with opposer within the meaning of Section 2(b) and (3) dilutes opposer's HAVANA CLUB

¹ Application Serial No. 75/720,955, filed November 30, 1999, claiming priority to 1,199 as the date of first use and first use in commerce.

trademark in violation of Sections 43(c) and 13. Applicant, in his answer, denied the salient allegations of the Notice of Opposition.

Now the case now comes up for consideration of applicant's motion for summary judgment. The motion has been fully briefed. In his motion, applicant argues that opposer lacks standing in this proceeding and cannot make a sufficient showing to establish the essential elements of any of its claims. Applicant's mark is primarily geographically descriptive; it does not disparage or falsely suggest a connection with applicant or dilutes opposer's HAVANA CLUB trademark.

Summary judgment is appropriate in cases where the moving party establishes that there is no genuine issue of material fact, that no further resolution at trial and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56. An issue is material when its resolution would affect the outcome of the proceeding under governing law.

Applicant, a corporation with its principal place of business in the State of New York, claims ownership of a trademark for rum manufactured exclusively in Cuba, and has applied for registration of this mark, No. 032424 (dated May 13, 1971). Opposer, a corporation with its principal place of business in the State of New York, claims ownership of two pending trademarks, Nos. 032424 and 032425, for "rums" and "rum" respectively, under Section 44(e) of the Trademark Act of 1946, 15 U.S.C. § 1052, for HAVANA CLUB for "rums" and "rum" respectively, in the Province of La Havana, Cuba; and (2) a trademark, No. 032424, for HAVANA CLUB and design for "rums" and "rum" respectively, in the Province of La Havana, Cuba." Action is presently suspended.

Section 44(a) are invalid under U.S. law because these applications are for marks that are the same as or substantially similar to a mark that was used in connection with a business that was confiscated by the Cuban government.

Opposer contends that its two pending applications filed under Section 44(e) of the Trademark Act provide standing in this matter because they were filed prior to the confiscation of the business herein. Opposer also contends that, pursuant to the law of the case doctrine, the Board "implicitly decided the issue of standing in favor of opposer" when it denied applicant's previous motion to dismiss under Section 44(a)(1). Additionally, opposer asserts that the business in Luxembourg is a corporation, and not a "designated person" under Cuban law, it is not subject to the Cuban nationalization provisions of U.S. law. Moreover, opposer argues that it is entitled to its right to the trademark in question.

Applicant contends that the Board never reached the issue of standing regarding opposer's standing in this matter and that the law of the case doctrine is inapplicable. Applicant contends that the Board merely denied opposer's motion to dismiss following the submission of opposer's evidence of opposition and applicant's lack of evidence of standing. Also, applicant asserts that it is entitled to its right to the trademark in question.

it does not fall within the purview of regulations
implemented by the Cuban embargo by claiming it is "...merely an
innocent foreign corporation...."

Appellant's contention with regard to the court's
ruling in *Galleon V* is essentially a claim that res
judicata and collateral issue preclusion, is appropriate in
this case.

Under the doctrine of issue preclusion (collateral
estoppel), a party is actually and necessarily
decided by a court of competent jurisdiction, that
decision is binding and conclusive in a subsequent suit
involving the same or the prior litigation.

United States v. Lindeburg & Co.,
723 F.2d 1007 (7th Cir. 1984). The
party who has litigated an
issue is bound by that decision and cannot
re-litigate the issue over again. *Mother's*
Pizzeria, Inc. v. ..., 723 F.2d
1007 (7th Cir. 1984).

If the court's decision to apply, the following
factors must be determined must

3. *United States v. Galleon, S.A. v. Galleon, S.A.*, 961 F.
2d 1007 (7th Cir. 1992); *Havana Club Holding,*
Inc. v. ..., 961 F.2d 1007 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) ("*Galleon*
v. ..."); *United States v. Galleon, S.A.*, 49 USPQ2d (BNA)
1007 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) ("*Galleon*"); *Havana Club Holding, S.A.*
1007 (S.D.N.Y. 1997) ("*Galleon*").

be identical to the issue involved in the prior litigation;
2) the issue must have been raised, litigated and actually
adjudicated in the prior action; 3) the determination of the
issue must have been necessary and essential to the
resulting judgment; and 4) the party precluded must have
been fully represented in the prior action. *Polaroid Corp.*
vs. Eastman Kodak Co., 52 USPQ2d 1954 (TTAB 1999);
see also *Res. Corp. vs. Res. Corp.*

The preclusion doctrine is applicable in the instant proceeding.
Opposer's rights in the HAVANA CLUB mark was an
integral part of the *Calleen V.* This issue was raised,
litigated and adjudicated in that case and opposer's
rights in the HAVANA CLUB were necessary and essential
to the judgment of the Second Circuit. Moreover,
opposer was fully represented in the prior action. Accordingly, we
affirm the findings of the Second Circuit
regarding opposer's mark and assignments as
being valid.

On appeal, Jose Arechabala, S.A.
alleges that the HAVANA CLUB was formed by members of the
HAVANA CLUB and owned the
HAVANA CLUB. The HAVANA CLUB exported the rum to the
HAVANA CLUB under Fidel Castro's government

confiscated JASA's assets, including the HAVANA CLUB mark.⁴ In 1993, the United States government imposed an embargo on Cuba.

Beginning in 1992, Empresa Cubana Exportadora De Alimentos y Productos Varios ("Cubaexport"), a Cuban state-run organization established by the Cuban Ministry of Foreign Commerce, exported HAVANA CLUB rum to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. This state enterprise registered the HAVANA CLUB mark in part with USPTO in 1976 under Registration No. 1,931,111.

In an effort to reorganize, Cubaexport became Havana Rum & Liqueurs S.A. ("HR&L") in 1993 and entered into a partnership with the French company Pernod Ricard, S.A., as the exclusive U.S. distributor. An agreement between HR&L and Pernod Ricard in 1993 created the opposer herein, Havana Rum & Liqueurs, Inc. ("HRL") and Havana Club International, Inc. ("HCI"). HRL is a Luxembourg corporation and HCI is a corporation organized under the laws of Cuba.

HR&L, HCI, and HRL assigned U.S. Registration No. 1,931,111 (for the HAVANA CLUB and design) to HR&L, and HRL assigned this registration to HCI.

Law No. 890 ("Law No. 890") was enacted by the Cuban government the physical business records of JASA. See DX 100-1000000. This legislation is ordered by the forced liquidation of JASA and commercial corporations, as well as the liquidation of warehouses and other assets and the liquidation of the following natural

After the reorganization, upon application by HCH in June 1994, the USPTO renewed the registration of the HAVANA CLUB for a term of ten years. In 1995, the Office of Export Assets Control ("OFAC") of the U.S. Department of Treasury issued a license to Cubaexport approving the export of rum from Cubaexport to HP&L and from HP&L to HCH. These licenses were nullified, however, when Cubaexport took the license in 1997, pursuant to Section 515.805 of the Cuban Assets Control Regulations ("CACR"), 31 C.F.R.

The Court in *Golden V* affirmed a holding of the District Court that the Havana Club did not have standing to sue for infringement of the HAVANA CLUB against another rum producer because it had no license to assign the mark to

On July 17, 1997, the District Court issued a Notice of Revocation stating that the first instances that have come to the attention of the Court, which were not included in the License No. C-18147 . . . is to the date of issuance." See *Havana Club, Inc. v. Golden V, S.A.*, 974 F. Supp. 302, 306

On July 17, 1997, the District Court issued a Notice of Revocation stating that the first instances that have come to the attention of the Court, which were not included in the License No. C-18147 . . . is to the date of issuance." See *Havana Club, Inc. v. Golden V, S.A.*, 974 F. Supp. 302, 306

1

standing only to show a personal interest in the outcome of the matter (beyond that of the general public").

In the present matter, we determine that applicant is entitled to standing that the Board never reached the issue of whether applicant has a personal interest in the decision regarding opposer's standing. Under the law of the case doctrine is

the manner in which to demonstrate standing is by proving a personal interest. A trademark registration or a trademark application may be rooted in the existence of the strictures of the relevant regulations surrounding its

Section 515, implements the U.S. embargo on trade with Cuba. As provided, the embargo prohibits, with certain exceptions, a Cuban national or entity has an interest in, including, without limitation, the exportation of, any property . . . of property by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; (C) "all transfers of property with regard to any property or

Section 5(b) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act ("LIBERTAD") (PL 104-114, 110 Stat. 3086 (1996)), was passed by the Congress of the United States. The regulations

in vest subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and (3) "any transaction for the purpose or which has the effect of evading or avoiding any of the prohibitions of the law at Section 515.201(b) and (c). The embargo on the property" to include trademarks. See id. at Section

In the case of the Cuban government, the court found that the party had no rights to U.S. Registration No. 1,111,111 for the word "CLUB" and design because the Cuban government had assigned the mark to the Cuban government. The OFAC's revocation of the specific assignment did not authorize the assignments.

Thus, the court found that the party's claim based on that registration.

The court also found that the party's claim based on claims of trademark infringement for the mark and its use in connection with the party's applications fails as a matter of law. The party is barred by statute from bringing a claim of trademark infringement that is the same

as the party's claim of trademark used in connection with the party's applications by the Cuban government.

On March 1, 1999, Congress passed Section 211 of the Cuban Assets Control Regulations Act 1999, as amended, which prohibits the Cuban government and Emergency

of the Cuban government (hereinafter "Section 211") from bringing a claim of trademark infringement.

the statute limits the registration and renewal of, and the assertion of trademark and trade name rights in, marks that are in connection with property confiscated by the Government. The statute, in relevant part, provides:

"The U.S. court shall recognize, enforce or determine the validity of any assertion of treaty rights by a person or his successor-in-interest under paragraph (e) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1055) for a mark, trade name or commercial name that is the same or substantially similar to the mark, trade name or commercial name that was used in connection with a business or assets that were confiscated from the original owner of such mark, trade name or commercial name, or the bona fide successor-in-interest of such owner."

It is true that the Board is not a "U.S. court" and that the restrictions of this statute apply only to "U.S. courts." It is true that the Board is not a "U.S. court" and that any judicial review of its decisions is to be made by a "U.S. court." See Section 21 of the Trademark Act of 1946 which would be barred from asserting its rights. It would not have standing to assert its rights. It would make no sense to ignore the Board's decision and its ability to assert its rights in connection with a decision that opposer could not assert its rights.

It is true that it does not fall within the language of Section 21 because it is not a "U.S. court" and it is not a "successor-in-interest" of the original owner. Section 21 states:

a term "designated national" has the
meaning given to that term in section 515.305
of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as
amended on September 9, 1998, and includes
a national of any foreign country who is a
partner-in-interest to a designated
national.

Under title 31 C.F.R. section 515.305 which defines a
"Designated National" as "an individual and any national thereof
included in an embargo list is a specially designated national."
A "Specially Designated National" is defined in 31 C.F.R.
Section 515.305 and includes "any partnership, association,
corporation, or other organization which on or since [July 8,
1998] has been controlled directly or indirectly by
the individual or organization exercising control over a
designated national or is a specially designated
national."

For example, a Luxembourg corporation, but it is 50% owned
by a designated national, and therefore, is a "designated
national" under the law. Similarly, an individual, or therefore
a "designated national," is a specially designated national, under Section
515.305 of the Code of Federal Regulations. As a
specially designated national, an owner is validly deemed a
partner-in-interest for purposes of Section 211.

Consequently, the law regarding Section 44(e)

is validly published under 31 C.F.R.

to the extent that under 31 C.F.R. Section 101.11, (b)(1) and (b)(2), applicants are precluded from filing and prosecuting applications for blocked trademarks." Thus, the Commission's decision is in full compliance with the embargo regulations.

... in relevant part:

...of opposition or
...to any blocked
...or freight, and the
...proceedings....

...with the right to file and
...and "thus with the precise predicate
...proceeding also fails as a matter of law
...as a "designated national."

Section 43 of the Trademark Act" establishes a
...be considered proper opposers,
...exists as to whether opposer
...as a person capable of filing an
...claim. With regard to opposer's claim,
...of the Trademark Act, that applicant's
...is primarily geographically
...does not originate from
...has no standing to pursue this
...to pursue its false
...Section 43(a) in *Galleon V.*
...District Court's holding that
...the Cuban embargo prevented
...in the United States, and thereby

...that the term "blocked foreign
...section means
...patent, trademark or copyright
...foreign
...interest, including any
...or copyright
...country."

...provides:

...be damaged by the
...may, upon payment
...the patent and
...

...suffering commercial injury because of Bacardi's actions;
and the District Court, as saying: "Any competitive
injury to the plaintiffs will suffer based upon their intent to enter
the U.S. market once the embargo is lifted is simply too
speculative to provide them with standing." *Galleon*
...*Wine & Spirit Society v. UDV North America*,
... (3rd Cir. 2001).

...the absence of a proprietary
...mark weighs against standing.
...[t]he owner of a famous
...to obtain such...relief as is
...Because opposer has no
...any attempt to calculate the
...needed.

...the claim involving Section
...that applicant's use of the
...or falsely suggest a
...is ill founded.
...to the HAVANA CLUB mark
...we are aware of no reason why
...brought about by the mere
...S.A.) to a
...in effect, confer standing
...

Opposer cannot demonstrate any real interest in the outcome of the proceeding and lacks standing to assert the defense in the proceeding. Accordingly, applicant's motion for summary judgment is granted and the opposition is dismissed."

"In view of our finding regarding opposer's lack of standing we need not address the issues with respect to opposer's substantive claims."

EXHIBIT B

M
J
F

On October 1, 2004, Fish & Neave became Fish & Neave LLP. Effective October 1, 2004, Fish & Neave merged with Ropes & Gray LLP. The merged entity will conduct business as Ropes & Gray LLP. Because Ropes & Gray will be the law firm in connection with the above-mentioned matters, Ropes & Gray hereby requests that you issue License No. EP-1243, or in the alternative, a new special license naming Ropes & Gray as the law firm, giving Ropes & Gray the same rights as authorized in License No. EP-1243.

We appreciate your attention to this matter. If we can be of further assistance, please contact us at (202) 462-1000.

Sincerely,
[Signature]

[Signature]

L
F

at [Signature] DEAC

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]

[Signature]



DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20220

Cuban Assets Control Regulations

License No. CT-1943

LICENSE

Authority: 31 C.F.R. App. 501, 28 U.S.C. 2370(a),
28 U.S.C. 2370(b), and 31 C.F.R. Parts 501 and 515

To: [Redacted]

The following is hereby licensed:

with or without the documents and representations made in your application, or otherwise filed
others, and is subject to the conditions, among
Treasury regulations, rulings, orders and instructions issued by the Secretary of the
the terms of this license.

request for inspection any relevant information, records or reports
of the Secretary.

and 515
discretion
any other
Treasury
is subject to the provisions of 31 C.F.R. Parts 501
and may be revoked or modified at any time at the
discretion of the Secretary through which the license was issued, or
as a result of willful
in the discretion of the Secretary of the
other data.

Any violation of the provisions of the regulation administered by the Office of Foreign
Assets Control in connection with the transaction(s) herein licensed, nor
for violation of any law or regulation.

Yours faithfully,
[Redacted]

[Signature] 12/20/43

U.S.C. 545, 18 U.S.C. 1001,
[Redacted] leading to penalties.]

Lib
Lic

Page 2 of 2

SMC
The licensee authorizes the licensee to engage in travel-related
activities of the Cuban Assets Control Regulations (the
provisions incident to professional research relevant to legal
proceedings, including conducting interviews and depositions, and
citizenship application, subject to the conditions set forth in Section
2.1.

for the licensee to, and to receive payment for such services
from the licensee (the "Licenses"), a Cuban national.

() The licensee shall be licensed.

A

The licensee shall provide a traveler with a letter confirming that the
traveler is traveling on behalf of the licensee and cite the number of this

() The licensee shall be licensed to perform other responsibilities under the
"Licenses" brochure or other
document authorized by 31 CFR 515.360(c) of

Notwithstanding the above, nothing in this license
shall be construed to authorize the licensee in any transaction or
activity that is inconsistent with the travel-related transactions consistent

The licensee is required to keep a list of
all travel-related activities of travel. Each
entry shall be made of each transaction. A report from the
licensee shall be submitted with an application to renew

activities of travel for which licenses
are authorized to Engage in Travel-
related Activities (Licenses Programs &

() The licensee shall be licensed to receive travel warnings) on
the licensee's part at
the licensee's part (202) 47-3000. An
application shall be submitted to 47-5225.

The licensee shall be licensed to the facts and
